UNITED
NATIONS

A S

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/50/79
S/1995/106
6 February 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Fiftieth session
COMMEMORATION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
Fiftieth year

Letter dated 3 February 1995 from the Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose a summary of "Our Global Neighbourhood", the report of the Commission on Global Governance, co-chaired by Mr. Ingvar Carlsson, Prime Minister of Sweden and Sir Shridath Ramphal, former Secretary-General of the Commonwealth of Nations.

I should be grateful if you would arrange for it to be circulated as a document of the General Assembly at its fiftieth session, under the item entitled "Commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations", and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Peter OSVALD
Ambassador
Permanent Representative of Sweden
to the United Nations

ANNEX

[Original: English/French]

# A call to action

## Summary of "Our Global Neighbourhood", the report of the Commission on Global Governance

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|---|
| EXTRACTS FROM THE CO-CHAIRMEN'S FOREWORD | 3 |
| SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS | 6 |
| Governance, Change and Values | 6 |
| Promoting Security | 8 |
| Managing Economic Interdependence | 10 |
| Reforming the United Nations | 11 |
| Strengthening the Rule of Law World-wide | 13 |
| THE NEXT STEPS | 14 |
| THE NEED FOR LEADERSHIP | 16 |
| Note on the Commission on Global Governance | 18 |

# EXTRACTS FROM CO-CHAIRMEN'S FOREWORD

The Charter of the United Nations was written while the world was still engulfed in war. Face to face with untold sorrow, world leaders were determined never to let it happen again. Affirming their faith in the dignity and worth of the human person, they set their minds on the advancement of all peoples. Their vision produced the world's most important political document.

Half a century has passed since the Charter was signed in San Francisco. There has been no world war in that time, but humanity has seen much violence, suffering and injustice. There remain dangers that could threaten human civilization and, indeed, the future of humankind.

But our dominant feeling is of hope. We believe the most notable feature of the past fifty years has been the emancipation and empowerment of people. People today have more power to shape their future than ever before; and that could make all the difference.

At the same time, nation-states find themselves less able to deal with the array of issues – some old, some new – that face them. States and their people, wishing to control their destinies, find they can do so only by working together with others. They must secure their future through commitment to common responsibility and shared effort.

The need to work together also guided the visionary men and women who drew up the Charter of the United Nations. What is new today is that the interdependence of nations is wider and deeper. What is also new is the role of people and the shift of focus from states to people. An aspect of this change is the growth of international civil society.

These changes call for reforms in the modes of international co-operation – the institutions and processes of global governance.

The international system that the UN Charter put in place needs to be renewed. The flaws and inadequacies of existing institutions have to be overcome. There is a need to weave a tighter fabric of international norms, expanding the rule of law world-wide and enabling citizens to exert their democratic influence on global processes.

We also believe the world's arrangements for the conduct of its affairs must be underpinned by certain common values. Ultimately, no organization will work and no law will be upheld unless they rest on a foundation made strong by shared values. These values must be informed by a sense of common responsibility for both present and future generations.

The members of the Commission, all serving in their personal capacities, come from many backgrounds and orientations. Yet, over the last two years together we have been united by one desire: to develop a common vision of the way forward for the world in making the transition from the cold war and in managing humanity's journey into the twenty-first century. We believe this report offers such a vision.

Each member of the Commission would have chosen different words, if he or she were writing this report alone. Everyone might not have fully embraced each and every proposal; but we all agreed on the overall substance and direction of the report. The strongest message we can convey is that humanity can agree on a better way to manage its affairs and give hope to present and future generations.

The development of global governance is part of the evolution of human efforts to organize life on the planet, and that process will always be going on. Our work is no more than a transit stop on that journey. We do not presume to offer a blueprint for all time. But we are convinced that it is time for the world to move on from the designs evolved over the centuries and given new form in the establishment of the United Nations nearly fifty years ago. We are in a time that demands freshness and innovation in global governance.

Global governance is not global government. No misunderstanding should arise from the similarity of the terms. We are not proposing movement towards world government, for were we to travel in that direction we might find ourselves in an even less democratic world than we have – one more accommodating to power, more hospitable to hegemonic ambition, and more reinforcing of the roles of states and governments rather than the rights of people.

This is not to say that the goal should be a world without systems or rules. Far from it. A chaotic world would pose equal or even greater dangers. The challenge is to strike the balance in such a way that the management of global affairs is responsive to the interests of all people in a sustainable future, that it is guided by basic human values, and that it makes global organization conform to the reality of global diversity.

Many pressures bear on political leaders, as they seek both to be effective and to retain support at the national level. Notwithstanding the drawbacks of nationalism, however, the history of even this century encourages us to believe that from the very best of national leaders can come the very best of internationalism. Today, a sense of internationalism has become a necessary ingredient of sound national policies. No nation can make progress heedless of insecurity and deprivation elsewhere. We have to share a global neighbourhood and strengthen it, so that it may offer the promise of a good life to all our neighbours.

Important choices must be made now, because we are at the threshold of a new era. That newness is self-evident; people everywhere know it, as do governments, though not all admit to it. We can, for example, go forward to a new era of security that responds to law and collective will and common responsibility by placing the security of people and of the planet at the centre. Or we can go backwards to the spirit and methods of what one of

our members described as the 'sheriff's posse' – dressed up to masquerade as global action.

There should be no question of which way we go. But the right way requires the assertion of the values of internationalism, the primacy of the rule of law world-wide, and institutional reforms that secure and sustain them. This report offers some suggestions for such responses.

Removed from the sway of empires and a world of victors and vanquished, released from the constraints of the cold war that so cramped the potential of an evolving global system throughout the post-war era, seized of the risk of unsustainable human impacts on nature, mindful of the global implications of human deprivation – the world has no real option but to rise to the challenge of change, in an enlightened and constructive fashion. We call on our global neighbours, in all their diversity, to act together to ensure this – and to act now.

**Ingvar Carlsson**
Stockholm

**Shridath Ramphal**
London

*November 1994*

# SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

In setting out the major proposals made by the Commission, we wish to emphasize that all the proposals form a coherent body – not inseparable, but mutually reinforcing. We encourage their consideration as such.

## GOVERNANCE, CHANGE AND VALUES

Global governance, once viewed primarily as concerned with intergovernmental relationships, now involves not only governments and intergovernmental institutions but also non-governmental organizations (NGOs), citizens' movements, transnational corporations, academia, and the mass media. The emergence of a global civil society, with many movements reinforcing a sense of human solidarity, reflects a large increase in the capacity and will of people to take control of their own lives.

States remain primary actors but have to work with others. The United Nations must play a vital role, but it cannot do all the work. Global governance does not imply world government or world federalism. Effective global governance calls for a new vision, challenging people as well as governments to realize that there is no alternative to working together to create the kind of world they want for themselves and their children. It requires a strong commitment to democracy grounded in civil society.

The changes of the last half-century have brought the global neighbourhood nearer to reality – a world in which citizens are increasingly dependent on one another and need to co-operate. Matters calling for global neighbourhood action keep multiplying. What happens far away matters much more now.

We believe that a global civic ethic to guide action within the global neighbourhood and leadership infused with that ethic are vital to the quality of global governance. We call for a common commitment to core values that all humanity could uphold: respect for life, liberty, justice and equity, mutual respect, caring, and integrity. We further believe humanity as a whole will be best served by recognition of a set of common rights and responsibilities.

It should encompass the right of all people to:

- a secure life,
- equitable treatment,
- an opportunity to earn a fair living and provide for their own welfare,
- the definition and preservation of their differences through peaceful means,
- participation in governance at all levels,
- free and fair petition for redress of gross injustices,
- equal access to information, and
- equal access to the global commons.

At the same time, all people share a responsibility to:

- contribute to the common good;
- consider the impact of their actions on the security and welfare of others;
- promote equity, including gender equity;
- protect the interests of future generations by pursuing sustainable development and safeguarding the global commons;
- preserve humanity's cultural and intellectual heritage;
- be active participants in governance; and
- work to eliminate corruption.

Democracy provides the environment within which the fundamental rights of citizens are best safeguarded, and the most favourable foundation for peace and stability. The world needs, however, to ensure the rights of minorities, and to guard against the ascendance of the military, and of corruption. Democracy is more than just the right to vote in regular elections. And as within nations, so globally, the democratic principle must be respected.

Sovereignty has been the cornerstone of the inter-state system. In an increasingly interdependent world, however, the notions of territoriality, independence, and non-intervention have lost some of their meaning. In certain areas, sovereignty must be exercised collectively, particularly in relation to the global commons. Moreover, the most serious threats to national sovereignty and territorial integrity now often have internal roots.

The principles of sovereignty and non-intervention must be adapted in ways that recognize the need to balance the rights of states with the rights of people, and the interests of nations with the interests of the global neighbourhood. It is time also to think about self-determination in the context of a global neighbourhood rather than a world of separate states.

Against the backdrop of an emerging global neighbourhood and the values that should guide its governance, we explored four specific areas: security, economic interdependence, the United Nations, and the rule of law. In each area we have sought to focus on governance aspects, but these are often inseparable from substantive issues.

## PROMOTING SECURITY

The concept of global security must be broadened from the traditional focus on the security of states to include the security of people and the security of the planet. The following six principles should be embedded in international agreements and used as norms for security policies in the new era:

- All people, no less than all states, have a right to a secure existence, and all states have an obligation to protect those rights.
- The primary goals of global security policy should be to prevent conflict and war, and maintain the integrity of the environment and life-support systems of the planet, by eliminating the economic, social, environmental, political, and military conditions that generate threats to the security of people and the planet, and by anticipating and managing crises before they escalate into armed conflicts.
- Military force is not a legitimate political instrument, except in self-defence or under UN auspices.
- The development of military capabilities beyond that required for national defence and support of UN action is a potential threat to the security of people.
- Weapons of mass destruction are not legitimate instruments of national defence.
- The production and trade in arms should be controlled by the international community.

Unprecedented increases in human activity and human numbers have reached the point where their impacts impinge on the basic conditions on which life depends. Action should be taken now to control these activities and keep population growth within acceptable limits so that planetary security is not endangered.

The principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of states should not be taken lightly. But it is necessary to assert as well the rights and interests of the international community in situations within individual states in which the security of people is extensively endangered. A global consensus exists today for a UN response on humanitarian grounds in such cases. We propose an amendment to the UN Charter to permit such intervention, but restricting it to cases that in the judgement of a reformed Security Council constitute a violation of the security of people so gross and extreme that it requires an international response on humanitarian grounds.

There should be a new 'Right of Petition' for non-state actors to bring situations massively endangering the security of people within states to the attention of the Security Council. The Charter amendment establishing the Right of Petition should also authorize the Security Council to call on parties to an intrastate dispute to settle it through the mechanisms listed in the Charter for the pacific settlement of disputes between states. The Council should be authorized to take enforcement action under Chapter VII if such efforts fail, but only if it determines that intervention is justified under the Charter amendment referred to in the previous paragraph on the grounds of

a gross violation of the security of people. Even then, the use of force would be the last resort.

We suggest two measures to improve UN peacekeeping. First, the integrity of the UN command should be respected; for each operation a consultative committee should be set up including representatives of the countries contributing troops. Second, although the principle that countries with a special interest in relation to a conflict should not contribute troops should be upheld, the earlier view that the permanent members of the Security Council should not play an active part in peacekeeping should be discarded.

New possibilities arise for the involvement of regional organizations in conjunction with the UN in resolving conflicts. We support the Secretary-General's plea for making more active use of regional organizations under Chapter VIII of the Charter.

The UN needs to be able to deploy credible and effective peace enforcement units at an early stage in a crisis and at short notice. It is high time that a UN Volunteer Force was established. We envisage a force with a maximum of 10,000 personnel. It would not take the place of preventive action, of traditional peacekeeping forces, or of large-scale enforcement action under Chapter VII of the Charter. Rather, it would fill a gap by giving the Security Council the ability to back up preventive diplomacy with a measure of immediate and convincing deployment on the ground. Its very existence would be a deterrent; it would give support for negotiation and peaceful settlement of disputes.

The international community must provide increased funds for peacekeeping, using some of the resources released by reductions of defence expenditures. The cost of peacekeeping should be integrated into a single annual budget and financed by assessments on all UN member countries, and the peacekeeping reserve fund should be increased to facilitate rapid deployment.

The international community should reaffirm its commitment to progressively eliminate nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction from all nations, and should initiate a ten to fifteen year programme to achieve this goal.

Work towards nuclear disarmament should involve action on four fronts:

- the earliest possible ratification and implementation of existing agreements on nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction;
- the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty;
- the conclusion of a treaty to end all nuclear testing; and
- the initiation of talks among all declared nuclear powers to establish a process to reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear arsenals.

All nations should sign and ratify the conventions on chemical and biological weapons, enabling the world to enter the twenty-first century free of these weapons.

For the first time, the dominant military powers have both an interest in reducing world-wide military capabilities and the ability to do so. The

international community should make the demilitarization of global politics an overriding priority.

Donor institutions and countries should evaluate a country's military spending when considering assistance to it. A Demilitarization Fund should be set up to help developing countries reduce their military commitments, and global military spending should be reduced to $500 billion by the end of the decade.

States should undertake immediate negotiation of a convention on the curtailment of the arms trade – including provision for a mandatory arms register and the prohibition of state financing or subsidy of arms exports.

## MANAGING ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE

Globalization is in danger of widening the gap between rich and poor. A sophisticated, increasingly affluent world currently coexists with a marginalized global underclass.

The pace of globalization of financial and other markets is outstripping the capacity of governments to provide the necessary framework of rules and co-operative arrangements. There are severe limits to national action to check such polarization within a globalized economy, yet the structures of global governance for pursuing international public policy objectives are underdeveloped.

The time is now ripe to build a global forum that can provide leadership in economic, social, and environmental fields. This should be more representative than the Group of Seven or the Bretton Woods institutions, and more effective than the present UN system. We propose the establishment of an Economic Security Council (ESC) that would meet at high political level. It would have deliberative functions only; its influence will derive from the relevance and quality of its work and the significance of its membership.

The ESC's tasks would be to:

- continuously assess the overall state of the world economy and the interaction between major policy areas;
- provide a long-term strategic policy framework in order to promote stable, balanced and sustainable development; and
- secure consistency between the policy goals of the major international organizations, particularly the Bretton Woods bodies and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

The ESC should be established as a distinct body within the UN family, structured like the Security Council, though not with identical membership and independent of it.

With some 37,000 transnational corporations world-wide, foreign investment is growing faster than trade. The challenge is to provide a framework of rules and order for global competition in the widest sense. The WTO should adopt a strong set of competition rules and a Global

Competition Office should be set up to oversee national enforcement efforts and resolve inconsistencies between them.

The decision-making structures of the Bretton Woods institutions must be made more reflective of economic reality; gross domestic product figures based on purchasing power parity should be used to establish national voting strength.

The role of the IMF should be enhanced by enabling it to:

- enlarge its capacity to provide balance-of-payments support through low-conditionality compensatory finance;
- have oversight of the international monetary system and a capacity to ensure that domestic economic policies in major countries are not mutually inconsistent or damaging to the rest of the international community;
- release a new issue of Special Drawing Rights; and
- improve its capacity to support nominal exchange rates in the interest of exchange rate stability.

For some countries, aid is likely to be for many years one of the main ways to escape from a low-income, low-savings, low-investment trap. There is no substitute for a politically realistic strategy to mobilize aid flows and to demonstrate value for money, including co-financing between official aid donors, the private sector, and NGOs with a view to widening the support base.

A false sense of complacency has enveloped the developing-country debt problem. Radical debt reduction is needed for heavily indebted, low-income countries, involving at least implementation of full 'Trinidad' terms, including the matter of multilateral debt.

In response to environmental concerns, governments should make maximum use of market instruments, including environmental taxes and traded permits, and adopt the 'polluter pays principle' of charging. We support the European Union's carbon tax proposal as a first step towards a system that taxes resource use rather than employment and savings, and urge its wide adoption.

It is time for a consensus on global taxation for servicing the needs of the global neighbourhood. A start must be made in establishing schemes of global financing of global purposes, including charges on the use of global resources such as flight-lanes, sea lanes, and ocean fishing areas and the collection of revenues agreed globally and implemented by treaty. An international tax on foreign currency transactions should be explored as one option, as should the creation of an international corporate tax base among multinational companies.

## REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS

We do not believe the UN should be dismantled to make way for a new architecture of global governance. Much of the necessary reform of the United Nations system can be effected without amending the Charter, provided governments are willing. But some Charter amendments are necessary for better global governance.

UN reform must reflect the realities of change, including the new capacity of civil society to contribute to global governance.

Reform of the Security Council is central to reforming the UN system. Permanent membership limited to five countries that derive their primacy from events fifty years ago is unacceptable; so is the veto. To add more permanent members and give them the veto would be regressive. We propose a process of reform in two stages.

First, a new class of five 'standing' members should be established to serve until the second stage of the reform process. We envisage two from industrial countries and one each from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The number of non-permanent members should be raised from ten to thirteen, and the votes required for a decision of the Council from nine to fourteen. To facilitate the phasing out of the veto, the permanent members should enter into a concordat agreeing to forgo its use save in exceptional and overriding circumstances.

The second stage should be a full review of the membership of the Council, including these arrangements, around 2005, when the veto can be phased out, the position of the permanent members reviewed, and account taken of new circumstances – including the growing strength of regional bodies.

The Trusteeship Council should be given a new mandate over the global commons in the context of concern for the security of the planet.

The General Assembly should be revitalized as a universal forum. Regular theme sessions, effective exercise of budgetary authority, and the streamlining of its agenda and procedures should be part of the process of revitalization. We also propose an annual Forum of Civil Society consisting of representatives of organizations to be accredited to the General Assembly as 'Civil Society Organizations'. It should be convened in the General Assembly Hall sometime before the Annual Session of the Assembly. International civil society should itself be involved in determining its character and functions.

The Right of Petition proposed for promoting the security of people requires the formation of a Council of Petitions – a high-level panel of five to seven persons, independent of governments, to entertain petitions. Its recommendations will go as appropriate to the Secretary-General, the Security Council, or the General Assembly, and allow for action under the Charter.

In the light of experience, the proposed Economic Security Council and our other recommendations, we propose that the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) should be wound up. The UN system must from time to time shut down institutions that can no longer be justified in objective terms. We believe this to be true also of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), and propose an in-depth review to this end. Our proposals on these UN bodies are part of the integrated set of proposals we make for improving global economic governance including, notably, the setting up of an Economic Security Council. Balanced governance arrangements will not result if policy leadership is preserved in the hands of a small directorate of countries, while such institutions as UNCTAD set up to correct imbalances are dismantled.

To help put women at the centre of global governance, a post of Senior Adviser on Women's Issues should be created in the Office of the UN Secretary-General, and similar positions established in the specialized agencies.

The UN must assist regionalism and gear itself for the time when regionalism is more ascendant world-wide. Regional bodies should be seen as an important part of a balanced system of global governance. However, the continuing utility of the UN Regional Economic Commissions now needs to be closely examined and their future determined in consultation with the respective regions.

The procedure for appointing the UN Secretary-General should be radically improved, and the term of office should be a single one of seven years. The procedure for selecting the heads of UN specialized agencies, funds, and programmes should also be improved.

## STRENGTHENING THE RULE OF LAW WORLD-WIDE

The global neighbourhood of the future must be characterized by law and the reality that all, including the weakest, are equal under the law and none, including the strongest, is above it. Our recommendations are directed to strengthening international law and the International Court of Justice in particular.

All member-states of the UN that have not already done so should accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The Court's chamber procedure should be modified to enhance its appeal to states and to avoid damage to the Court's integrity.

Judges should be appointed for one ten-year term only, and a system introduced to screen potential members for jurisprudential skills and objectivity. The UN Secretary-General should have the right to refer legal aspects of international issues to the Court for advice, particularly in the early stages of disputes.

The Security Council should appoint a distinguished lawyer to provide advice at all relevant stages on the international legal aspects of issues before it. It should also make greater use of the World Court as a source of advisory opinions, to avoid being itself the judge of international law in particular cases.

We do not emphasize formal enforcement measures but, failing voluntary compliance, Security Council enforcement of World Court decisions and other international legal obligations should be pursued under Article 94 of the Charter.

An International Criminal Court should be quickly established with independent prosecutors of the highest calibre and experience.

The International Law Commission or other appropriate body should be authorized to explore how international law-making can be expedited.

# THE NEXT STEPS

We have made many recommendations, some of them far-reaching. We would like to go one step further by suggesting a process for the consideration of these and similar recommendations.

During the time the Commission has been at work, we have witnessed the currencies of Europe held hostage by forces of speculation themselves out of control. Powerful economies confronted each other on the threshold of trade wars, while marginal ones collapsed. There was ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, a 'failed state' in Somalia, and genocide in Rwanda. Nuclear weapons lay unsecured in the former Soviet Union, and neofascism surfaced in the West.

The United Nations faces much greater demands. Its existence is a continuing reminder that all nations form part of one world, though evidence is not lacking of the world's many divisions. Today's interdependencies are compelling people to recognize the unity of the world. People are forced not just to be neighbours but to be good neighbours.

Our report is issued in the year the UN marks a jubilee. It is not tied to that one event or to the UN system alone. It speaks to a longer time and a larger stage, but the UN and its future are a central part of our concerns. It is important that the international community should use the UN's anniversary as an occasion for renewing commitment to the spirit of the Charter and the internationalism it embodied, and establish a process that can take the world to a higher stage of international co-operation. This process must be centred on the UN but not confined to it.

Ours are not the only recommendations that will be considered in the anniversary year. The variety of reports and studies presenting the case for change and proposing the form it should take reflects wide recognition that change is needed. That itself does not guarantee action to bring about change. The will to change does not exist everywhere. It would be easy for all the effort to promote reform to be stalled by a filibuster or simply by inertia. Or, paradoxically, it could be overwhelmed by the onset of the very dangers that some of the changes proposed are meant to guard against.

We are prompted to recall the vision that drove the process of founding the United Nations and the spirit of innovation that ushered in a new era of global governance. We need that spirit again today.

We fear that if reform is left to normal processes, only piecemeal and inadequate action will result. We look, therefore, to a more deliberate

process. The Charter has been amended on four occasions. But revision of the Charter is the final stage in a process of reform and is not required for many of the changes we propose.

The ultimate process has to be intergovernmental and at a high level, giving political imprimatur to a new world order whose contours are shaped to the designs developed for the anniversary year.

For such a process to have the best prospect of securing agreement on a new system of global governance, there will need to be careful preparation. Civil society must be involved in the preparatory process, which should reach out to even wider sections of society than the processes leading up to recent world conferences. Many views must be examined, and many ideas allowed to contend.

Our recommendation is that the General Assembly should agree to hold a World Conference on Governance in 1998, with its decisions to be ratified and put into effect by 2000. That will allow more than two years for the preparatory process.

Action on all recommendations does not have to await the final conference. Many of the changes proposed do not need an amendment of the Charter. Some changes are already under way. We encourage action on reform at all levels – provided, of course, that ad hoc decisions do not become a substitute for systematic reform through a fully representative forum.

A special responsibility devolves on the non-governmental sector. If our recommendations and those from other sources are worthy of support, international civil society must prevail on governments to consider them seriously. By doing so they would ensure that 'WE THE PEOPLES' are the instruments of change to a far greater extent than fifty years ago. We call on international civil society, NGOs, the business sector, academia, the professions, and especially young people to join in a drive for change in the international system.

Governments can be made to initiate change if people demand it. That has been the story of major change in our time; the liberation of women and the environmental movement provide examples. If people are to live in a global neighbourhood and live by neighbourhood values, they have to prepare the ground. We believe that they are ready to do so.

# THE NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

Whatever the dimensions of global governance, however renewed and enlarged its machinery, whatever values give it content, the quality of global governance depends ultimately on leadership. Throughout our work, we have been conscious of the degree to which the realization of our proposals depends on leadership of a high order at all levels.

As the world faces the need for enlightened responses to the challenges that arise on the eve of the new century, we are concerned at the lack of leadership over a wide spectrum of human affairs. At national, regional, and international levels, within communities and in international organizations, in governments and in non-governmental bodies, the world needs credible and sustained leadership.

It needs leadership that is proactive, not simply reactive, that is inspired, not simply functional, that looks to the longer term and future generations for whom the present is held in trust. It needs leaders made strong by vision, sustained by ethics, and revealed by political courage that looks beyond the next election.

This cannot be leadership confined within domestic walls. It must reach beyond country, race, religion, culture, language, life-style. It must embrace a wider human constituency, be infused with a sense of caring for others, a sense of responsibility to the global neighbourhood

To a very particular degree today, the need for leadership is widely felt, and the sense of being bereft of it is the cause of uncertainty and instability. It contributes to a sense of drift and powerlessness. It is at the heart of the tendency everywhere to turn inwards. That is why we have attached so much importance to values, to the substance of leadership and the compulsions of an ethical basis for global governance. A neighbourhood without leadership is a neighbourhood endangered.

When we talk of the need for leadership we do not mean only at the highest national and international levels. We mean enlightenment at every level – in local and national groups, in parliaments and in the professions, among scientists and writers, in small community groups and large national NGOs, in international bodies of every description, in religious communities, in political parties and citizens' movements, in the private sector and among transnational corporations, and particularly in the media.

A great challenge to leadership today is to harmonize domestic demands for national action and the compulsions of international co-operation. It is not a new challenge, but it has a new intensity as globalization diminishes the capacity to deliver at home and enlarges the need to combine efforts abroad. Enlightened leadership calls for a clear vision of solidarity in the true interest of national well-being - and for political courage in articulating the way the world has changed and why a new spirit of global neighbourhood must replace old notions of adversarial states in eternal confrontation.

The alternative is too frightening to contemplate. In a final struggle for primacy - in which each sees virtue in advancing its national self-interest, with states and peoples pitted against each other - there can be no winners. Everyone will lose; selfishness will make genius the instrument of human self-destruction. But the leadership to avert this is not sufficiently evident. The hope must be people - people demanding enlightenment of their leaders, refusing to accept the alternative of humanity at war with itself. And that hope is balanced by the promise of the leadership that future generations will bring.

In a real sense the global neighbourhood is the home of future generations; global governance is the prospect of making it better than it is today. But that hope would be a pious one were there not signs that future generations come to the task better equipped than their parents. They bring to the next century less of the baggage of old animosities and adversarial systems accumulated in the era of nation-states.

The new generation knows how close they stand to cataclysms unless they respect the limits of the natural order and care for the earth by sustaining its life-giving qualities. They have a deeper sense of solidarity as people of the planet than any generation before them. They are neighbours to a degree no other generation has been.

ON THAT RESTS OUR HOPE FOR OUR GLOBAL NEIGHBOURHOOD.

## THE COMMISSION ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

The Commission on Global Governance was established in 1992 in the belief that international developments had created favourable circumstances for strengthening global co-operation to create a more peaceful, just and habitable world for all its people.

The first steps leading to its formation were taken by former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, who a decade earlier had chaired the Independent Commission on International Development Issues. A meeting he convened in January 1990 asked Ingvar Carlsson (Prime Minister of Sweden), Shridath Ramphal (then Commonwealth Secretary-General) and Jan Pronk (Netherlands Minister for Development Co-operation) to prepare a report on the new prospects for world co-operation.

Some three dozen public figures who met in Stockholm in April 1991 to consider this report proposed, in their Stockholm Initiative on Global Security and Governance, that an international commission should recommend ways by which world security and governance could be improved, given the opportunities created by the end of the cold war for enhanced co-operation.

Willy Brandt, after consulting Gro Harlem Brundtland and Julius Nyerere, who had headed two previous commissions, invited Ingvar Carlsson and Shridath Ramphal to chair the new commission. The Commission, with twenty-eight members all serving in their personal capacity, started work in September 1992.

The Commission held eleven meetings, six in Geneva (where its secretariat was established) and the others in New York, Cuernavaca (Mexico), Tokyo, Brussels, and Visby (Sweden). It commissioned a number of papers; it had discussions with several of their authors, a number of persons from public life, and representatives of many civil society organizations. Discussions on key issues on the Commission's agenda were arranged by the Common Security Forum, the Norwegian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Centre for the Study of Global Governance at the London School of Economics. The UN University co-hosted a public symposium with the Commission in Tokyo. Regional consultations with experts were arranged, with the collaboration of local organizations, in San Jose (Costa Rica), Cairo and New Delhi.

Support for the Commission's work was provided by the governments of Canada, Denmark, India, Indonesia, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, two UN Trust Funds established by Japan, the Canton of Geneva, the government of Mexico City, the European Commission, the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (Kuwait), the MacArthur Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation (all of the United States), the World Humanity Action Trust (United Kingdom), and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Germany).

The Commission decided at an early stage to remain active in efforts to disseminate its report, *Our Global Neighbourhood*, and to promote its ideas and recommendations. These will be pursued through speaking engagements, seminars and workshops; work with governments, international organizations, NGOs, the media; and the distribution of material.

The Commission's secretariat will continue to function in order to co-ordinate this work:

The Commission on Global Governance
Case Postale 184
CH-1211 GENEVA 28
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 798 2713
Fax: +41 22 798 0147

## CO-CHAIRMEN

| | |
|---|---|
| **Ingvar Carlsson** | Sweden |
| **Shridath Ramphal** | Guyana |

## MEMBERS

| | |
|---|---|
| **Ali Alatas** | Indonesia |
| **Abdlatif Al-Hamad** | Kuwait |
| **Oscar Arias** | Costa Rica |
| **Anna Balletbo** | Spain |
| **Kurt Biedenkopf** | Germany |
| **Allan Boesak** | South Africa |
| **Manuel Camacho Solis** | Mexico |
| **Bernard Chidzero** | Zimbabwe |
| **Barber Conable** | United States |
| **Jacques Delors** | France |
| **Jiri Dienstbier** | Czech Republic |
| **Enrique Iglesias** | Uruguay |
| **Frank Judd** | United Kingdom |
| **Hongkoo Lee** | Republic of Korea |
| **Wangari Maathai** | Kenya |
| **Sadako Ogata** | Japan |
| **Olara A. Otunnu** | Uganda |
| **I.G. Patel** | India |
| **Celina do Amaral Peixoto** | Brazil |
| **Jan Pronk** | The Netherlands |
| **Qian Jiadong** | China |
| **Marie-Angélique Savané** | Senegal |
| **Adele Simmons** | United States |
| **Maurice Strong** | Canada |
| **Brian Urquhart** | United Kingdom |
| **Yuli Vorontsov** | Russia |

---